

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 \* \* \*

9 SEAN DAVID COTTLE,

Case No. 3:12-cv-00645-MMD-WGC

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER

11 v.

12 NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
13 CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendant.

14  
15 Before the Court are plaintiff's motion for leave to amend complaint (dkt. no. 19),  
16 motion for leave to extend parts B, C on amended complaint (dkt. no. 20), and motion  
17 for leave to add the previous exhibits from original complaint to amended complaint (dkt.  
18 no. 21). The Court finds amendment of the complaint would be futile, and the Court  
19 denies the motion for leave to amend complaint.

20 The Court had dismissed some of plaintiff's claims from the original complaint.  
21 Screening Order (dkt. no. 4). The proposed amended complaint omits the claims that  
22 the Court had dismissed. The proposed amended complaint also adds a new count III.  
23 Plaintiff alleges that defendants Cox and Bannister have retaliated against him for the  
24 commencement of this action, by cancelling his appointment to the Hopes clinic. "A  
25 prisoner suing prison officials under section 1983 for retaliation must allege that he was  
26 retaliated against for exercising his constitutional rights and that the retaliatory action  
27 does not advance legitimate penological goals, such as preserving institutional order  
28 and discipline." *Barnett v. Centoni*, 31 F.3d 813, 815-16 (9th Cir. 1994) (per curiam).

1       The proposed count III contains two defects. First, and fatal, is that the facts  
2 petitioner alleges in count III make a claim of retaliation impossible. Based upon the  
3 exhibits attached to other documents, plaintiff was informed on January 9, 2013, that  
4 there was no Hopes clinic for that month. Plaintiff alleges that defendants Cox and  
5 Bannister started cancelling his appointments after plaintiff commenced this action in  
6 December 2012.<sup>1</sup> However, the defendants did not have notice of this action any earlier  
7 than January 29, 2013, when the Court entered its Screening Order (dkt. no. 4) and  
8 electronically served the Attorney General of the State of Nevada with a copy of the  
9 complaint. Defendants Cox and Bannister would have needed the ability to see into the  
10 future to retaliate in the manner that plaintiff alleges.

11       Second, plaintiff has not alleged any facts indicating that defendants Cox and  
12 Bannister had any personal knowledge or involvement in the cancellation of the  
13 appointment. The Court has already explained in the Screening Order (dkt. no. 4) that  
14 supervisors such as Cox and Bannister cannot be held personally liable for the actions  
15 of subordinates, unless they had personal knowledge or involvement in the challenged  
16 acts. See *Ybarra v. Reno Thunderbird Mobile Home Village*, 723 F.2d 675, 680 (9th  
17 Cir. 1984). The exhibits attached to other documents included communications between  
18 plaintiff and prison medical staff members, not defendants Cox or Bannister. Without  
19 facts connecting defendants Cox and Bannister to the cancellation of his appointment,  
20 amendment of the complaint would be futile.

21       The denial of the motion for leave to amend the complaint (dkt. no. 19) makes  
22 moot the motion for leave to extend parts B, C on amended complaint (dkt. no. 20) and  
23 the motion for leave to add the previous exhibits from original complaint to amended  
24 complaint (dkt. no. 21). The Court denies these motions, too.

25       ///

26

---

27       <sup>1</sup>The Court will write as if plaintiff had an appointment that was cancelled.  
28       However, plaintiff's own exhibits indicate that he never had any such appointment at the  
Hopes clinic.

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for leave to amend the  
2 complaint (dkt. no. 19) is DENIED.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for leave to extend parts B, C  
4 on amended complaint (dkt. no. 20) and motion for leave to add the previous exhibits  
5 from original complaint to amended complaint (dkt. no. 21) are DENIED as moot.

6 DATED THIS 27<sup>th</sup> day of August 2013.  
7



8  
9 MIRANDA M. DU  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28